

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 15, 16 and 44-48 have been examined. Claims 44, 46, and 47 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-5, 15, 16, 45 and 48 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-3, 15, 44, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Snaper et al., US 4,140,370 (Henceforth Snaper). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that an adhesive layer which fixes the optical unit and the display panel is provided at a part of an area enclosing an image display area. This adhesive layer serves to attach the optical unit to the display panel and prevent movement of the optical unit relative to the display panel. As described in the specification of the present application, no adhesive layer is provided on a part of the area enclosing the image display area, nor over the entire area outside the display area.

The Examiner maintains that Fig. 14 of Snaper discloses an adhesive layer as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fig. 14 of Snaper discloses an optical screen 66 attached to the frame or case of a CRT-based television screen by suitable means on the periphery 70 of a peripheral mask 68 (column 7, lines 28-33). The optical screen 66 is not directly attached to the display panel as recited in claim 1. As such, since the case or frame are usually molded plastic, unlike the display panel itself, there is virtually no difference in heat expansion or contraction resulting from thermal changes between the optical unit and the display panel. Further, the attachment means in Snaper is shown to be on the Periphery 70 of the mask, not the area 68. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Snaper. Further, claims 2, 3, 15 and 45 are

dependant from claim 1 and are patentable by virtue of their dependency thereon. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 15 and 45.

***Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 4, 5, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Snaper in view of Eichenlaub, US 5,410,345 (Henceforth Eichenlaub). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 4, 5, and 16 each depend from claim 1 which has been shown above to be patentable over the Snaper reference. Eichenlaub does not cure this deficiency because Eichenlaub contains no teachings relevant to an adhesive layer. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4, 5, and 16.

Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Snaper in view of Takahasi et al., US 4,921,330 (henceforth Takahasi). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 48 recites a means for fixing the optical unit to the display panel such that an unfixed part between the optical unit and the display panel may be deformed to absorb stress. The Examiner admits that Snaper does not teach this recitation. The Examiner alleges that fig. 2 of Takahasi provides a fixing means 8 to install an optical unit S on a display panel 1. The Examiner maintains that the component donated by reference numeral “1” shown in Fig. 2 of Takahasi corresponds to a display panel. However, Applicant submits that this is mistaken because component “1” is merely a cabinet. In Takahasi, the composite screen (S) has been attached to a cabinet (1), not to a display panel. In fact, there is no display panel in Takahasi because it relates to a rear projection screen for a video projector. Reference numerals 2 and 3 both denote lens plates of the composite screen and if the lens plates are considered the optical

unit, no display panel exists in Takahasi. Further, the lenticular lens plate 3 shown in Takahasi is merely used as a diffusing means, not as a lens, so that positioning and fixing of the plate are not necessary. Since there is no need to fix the plate, there is no concern for expansion and contraction thereof. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 48 is patentable over the combination of Snaper and Takahasi and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 48.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Howard L. Bernstein/ hlb

---

Howard L. Bernstein  
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 30, 2007